



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 25, 2019

No. 51

## Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O Lord God, the almighty and the all-wise, Your judgments and ways are past finding out.

Bless our Senators with strength sufficient for today's challenges, illuminating their paths with Your light. May they walk in the way of integrity and sacrifice. Lord, let Your power purify their thoughts as Your truth guides their words. Teach them to cheerfully do Your will, surrounding them with the shield of Your providential love. Use them to fulfill Your purposes for our Nation and humanity.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWLEY). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will pro-

ceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bridget S. Bade, of Arizona, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

### MIDWESTERN FLOODS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to share a message from Iowa's heartland.

As you know, millions of Americans in the middle of the country are experiencing catastrophic flooding. My home State of Iowa and our neighbors in Nebraska are particularly hard hit, and it will affect others downriver of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers.

I want to thank the Trump administration for its swift response on Saturday to approve the expedited requests for a major disaster declaration made by Iowa Governor Kim Reynolds Thursday evening. The flooding has caused tremendous damage, impacting more than two-thirds of Iowa's 99 counties. The Federal disaster proclamation will trigger emergency assistance to 56 of those counties so far. Those would be the counties in blue on the map here.

Governor Reynolds' team has been in the trenches, working hand in hand with local officials and county emergency coordinators. They estimated damages so far across our entire State to be \$1.6 billion. The damages estimated for agriculture are \$214 million; damages to homes, \$481 million; and levee repairs, \$525 million.

By all accounts and every possible metric, the damages and devastation are overwhelming. Yet, at the very same time, the legendary mythology of America's heartland and its people is rooted in truth. The road to recovery will be long, grueling, and at times gruesome, but I am confident that the grit and resilience of Iowans and their fellow midwesterners will prevail.

Over the last week, we have heard remarkable stories of neighbor helping

neighbor and neighbors helping total strangers. Residents of all ages and differing abilities rubbed elbows to bag sand to save a water treatment facility in their small town. First responders and Good Samaritans rescued people stranded in their homes. Farmers moved their neighbor's grain and livestock to higher ground. Volunteers rolled up their sleeves to serve hot meals and deliver water. Generous Americans across our country opened their wallets to donate money, food, water, hygiene products, and medical supplies. Iowa farmers who were not wiped out by the floods are sending truckloads of much needed hay to livestock producers and ranchers in Nebraska.

These stories offer a glimmer of sunshine in the darkest hours of the 2019 floods. You might say that we are experiencing an unwelcome twist of March Madness along the Missouri River. Despite being mired in muck and mud, it is reassuring to see the full-court press and gritty resilience of midwesterners.

Make no mistake—the catastrophic damages to private property, farmland, Main Street businesses, public utilities, and critical infrastructure, including wells, roads, bridges, and railways, have extended beyond the capability of local and State government.

Aerial footage of our State makes entire communities and farmsteads look like an island surrounded by an ocean. You can see some of that here in this photo that was taken just last week. You see here a small community along the Missouri River. This is the town of Pacific Junction, which is located in the southwestern corner of the State in Mills County. Its entire population was forced to evacuate. As you can see from this photo, the rooftops of homes appear to be floating in the muddy waters of a Monopoly board.

I ask my colleagues here in the Senate and I ask Americans listening at home to put yourselves in the shoes of those evacuated from their homes.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1919

Imagine if this were your home soaking in unsanitary water for days on end. Consider for a moment the damages to your furniture, clothes, appliances, and your most prized possessions. Think how much it would cost to replace those items. Now add up the countless hours of hard work it would take to clean up the mess, mud, muck, and mold once the water finally recedes.

I have another photo here I want you to look at. Let's now turn to a photo taken near Pacific Junction.

I thank Larry Winum of Glenwood, IA, a constituent and a friend, for sharing these photos.

Just think of the small businesses impacted by the floods. The photo here of a motel illustrates how flooding can wash away the livelihoods of business owners and their employees. This particular business will indefinitely have zero occupancy. Even if the roads were open, this business would need a floor-to-ceiling refurbishment to replace beds, linens, carpets, and towels, and most likely even significant plumbing and electrical work.

I want to show a photo of Main Street in Hamburg, IA. This community was hard hit in 2011. I was there in 2011. It is worse now. You can see it is underwater in 2019.

Let's examine how the flooding has affected our farmers. As a lifelong farmer, I know exactly what farmers across my State are feeling at this time of the year. They get very antsy and keep constant watch on the weather, soil temperatures, and planting conditions for their seed. They have ordered seeds and fertilizers. These farmers are chomping at the bit to get started on field work.

Now imagine the farmers along the Missouri River. Tens of thousands of acres of farmland are underwater. For sure, these acres may never be ready for planting this season.

Now consider the farmers who were storing grain in the bins along the Missouri. Millions of bushels of flood-soaked grain have spilled into murky floodwaters.

This picture says it all. This is grain that farmers were counting on to pay the bills to put this year's crop in the ground. This photo was shared courtesy of State Representative David Sieck, whose legislative district is almost completely impacted by the flood damages. I thank David for sharing.

My State staff tells me that some farmers in the flooded areas didn't get last fall's crop fully harvested, and of course that is destroyed.

Since March 12, my staff has been crisscrossing scores of Iowa counties to visit affected communities and meet directly with Iowans. They are sharing directly with me the feedback from Iowans. I am making plans to visit affected areas as soon as I can as well. I am anxious to measure recovery and cleanup efforts to inform my decisions on tax and spending policies that are needed to help with recovery efforts going forward.

As my speech and these photos suggest to all and I hope will suggest to each of my colleagues here in the Senate, we have a long road to recovery from the floods of 2019. In fact, it could be worse. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration issued a wake-up call last week. We are not yet out of the woods—not by a long shot. With more precipitation, snowmelt, saturated soils, frozen ground, and massive ice jams, we are in store for significant spring flooding that may reach 200 million Americans.

Today, I have talked largely about the extent of damages and the recovery efforts that are just getting started. It is also important to talk about flood mitigation. Breached, overtopped, or compromised levees span hundreds of miles on the Missouri River along the States of Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri.

It took a long time for these communities to recover from flooding that took place 8 years ago. It is no wonder an awful lot of Iowans are feeling like they are way back to square one again.

Iowans, especially those who live along the Missouri River, want and deserve answers. Southwest Iowa communities have raised grave concern about the unresponsive Corps of Engineers—specifically, about the lack of communication and about not enough river dredging, water release, and about ordering the town of Hamburg, back in 2011, to remove reinforcements of the now-breached levee that left the town under water.

I, too, share the concerns that have been expressed to the Corps of Engineers. I have had a chance to talk to the Corps headquarters in Omaha. For years I have worked with several of my midwestern colleagues along the Missouri River to make flood control the No. 1 priority of the Corps.

It seems to me that misguided decisions and misplaced priorities have eclipsed common sense. As I told you, I talked last week with the commander of the Corps in Omaha and shared my concerns about the lack of communication and coordination with local communities. Perhaps a good scrubbing of the Master Manual of the Corps of Engineers for the Missouri River may help to clear the wax out of bureaucratic ears that haven't gotten the message.

The No. 1 priority of the Corps should be flood control—flood control, period. I started out today by saying that I wanted to share a message from America's heartland. I close my remarks by sending a message to that American heartland.

As Iowa's senior Senator, I will stand with you every step of the way. My staff and I are working very closely with Iowa and midwestern congressional delegations, the Trump administration, and State agencies to make sure disaster relief programs are working effectively for homeowners, small businesses, farmers, and our local communities.

The best I thing I can say to any Federal Agency and their employees, the Corps of Engineers, FEMA, and many others is to use a little common sense and cut out a lot of the redtape, but here is where it ends.

When the going gets tough, Iowans get tougher. So hang tough, keep fighting, and know that help is on the way.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MUELLER REPORT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as the world now knows, yesterday evening Attorney General Barr sent a letter to Congress on the investigation by the special counsel. In his letter, Attorney General Barr confirmed the intelligence community's assessment that through a coordinated disinformation campaign and hacking operations, Russia sought to interfere with the 2016 election. Any attempts by a foreign government to interfere with our Democratic processes, successful or unsuccessful, must not be taken lightly.

Though the special counsel's investigation was very targeted and specific, Members of the Senate Intelligence Committee, on which I serve, continue our work to more closely examine the matter as well as the broader threats posed by foreign interference as part of our oversight responsibilities. Although this was the major focus of the special counsel's investigation, it was not the most anticipated portion of Mr. Mueller's report.

After reviewing the special counsel's findings, the Attorney General concluded that the Trump campaign did not coordinate with the Russian Government in their efforts to influence the election. Based on their reaction since General Barr released his letter, it is clear the partisans who will never be satisfied with any results of an investigation will not be appeased by this report from the special counsel or General Barr's summary of Mr. Mueller's conclusions.

I hope our colleagues will trust the dedicated team of public servants who investigated this matter for the special counsel and now allow Congress to move on so we can deal with other challenges facing the American people. The worst thing we can do is get bogged down in a relitigation of all these issues over which we have no real authority because Congress's role is to conduct oversight for purposes of determining whether the laws have been faithfully executed or whether changes in the law need to occur. Obviously, the special counsel's role is entirely different. It is a criminal investigation

to determine whether there is sufficient evidence of a violation of a criminal law that would warrant presentation to a grand jury, charging, and then a trial. Congress's role is demonstrably and decidedly different.

I would like to thank Mr. Mueller for conducting his investigation with the utmost professionalism. For those of us who have seen him in action over many years, we expected nothing different. I would also like to thank Attorney General Barr for promptly communicating his conclusions with both Congress and the American people. Throughout Attorney General Barr's confirmation hearings, he stressed his intent to release as much information as possible, and he is now in the process of delivering on his word.

I agree with those on both sides of the aisle, as well as the President, who want the Mueller report to be released publicly. As much of the report as can be released, and consistent with existing law, should be made public so the American people can read it for themselves, but I also agree with the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator GRAHAM, that we also need to understand better how we got to this place.

We need to look at the decisions made by the leadership in the Department of Justice, the FBI, the intelligence community, and the Obama White House during the time in which this counterintelligence investigation was initiated against President Trump while he was still a candidate, and why, contrary to the practice as testified to by Attorney General Loretta Lynch, a defensive briefing was not given to the Trump campaign so they could know that the Russians were trying the doors and the windows and trying to get into the organization.

We know now, from Mr. Mueller's report, they were unsuccessful in establishing a connection and collusion, as the word has been used, but we know the investigation that initially was started, ultimately, came up empty-handed and resulted in this narrative, which prompted the appointment of a special counsel and this long investigation that Mr. Mueller has now completed. So we need to understand that better as part of our oversight responsibilities, particularly those of us, such as the Presiding Officer and I, who are on the Judiciary Committee who have explicit oversight responsibility for the Department of Justice as well as the FBI.

#### THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. President, on another matter, we will soon have an opportunity to vote on the Green New Deal. Since this resolution was introduced last month, there has been a lot of confusion about exactly what is in it and how much it would cost. Generally, those aren't great questions to leave unanswered when you are trying to pass something in the Senate. We need more information, to be sure.

When the resolution was released, it made some lofty promises: achieving

net zero greenhouse gas emissions, renovating or replacing all buildings to achieve maximum energy efficiency, and providing higher education, healthcare, and housing for everybody. Missing, of course, were some of the details about how these goals would be either feasible or affordable: no plans on how to incentivize the research and development of new, cleaner energy technologies; no specifics on how much it would cost to retrofit every existing building in the country; no estimates about how the long list of new entitlement programs would be funded. The confusion only grew stronger when one of the authors of the resolution released a background summary that made even more promises, again, with no assurance of any plan that would actually be feasible or could be implemented. The Congresswoman from New York claimed that the Green New Deal would even include a government-subsidized life for those who are unwilling to work. She said we will build high-speed rail that will make airline travel unnecessary, which came as a surprise to our colleagues from Hawaii, and she said we will replace every internal combustion engine in every vehicle. As you might imagine, there was a long list of unanswered questions.

The one thing we know about the Green New Deal is, it would be a bad deal for Texas. Our State has always embraced an "all of the above" attitude when it comes to energy. Our people don't expect handouts, but they do expect opportunities that only come with economic and individual freedom. They don't want to be told what the government will permit them to do or force them to do, and they certainly don't want to be taxed to death to support people who aren't willing to work. We believe the government that governs least governs best in a nation of laws, especially when it comes to our economy.

Texas keeps its taxes, government spending, and regulations at a rational minimum to give people and small businesses that create jobs the freedom to dream big and let the free market provide. We know it works. Lower taxes and less burdensome regulation draw businesses to our State. We are one of the fastest growing States in the Nation because people are literally voting with their feet. It is because we have seen jobs created and opportunities for everyone willing to work.

Our unemployment rate is at or below the national average. I believe, in Midland, TX, in the Permian Basin, it is 2.1 percent. They can't find enough able-bodied people to perform the good, well-paying jobs that exist. We know we lead the Nation in exports, fueling both the State's economy as well as that for the entire country.

As I just alluded, the major part of our State's success is our thriving energy industry. Something that will not come as a surprise to most people is the fact that Texas leads the country in both oil and natural gas production,

but what may surprise you is the fact that we are the No. 1 producer of electricity from wind energy. One-fourth of all U.S. wind energy comes from Texas. There is no doubt that Texas's position as the largest energy-producing State has secured our position as an economic powerhouse, but if the authors of the Green New Deal get their way, oil, gas, and all hydrocarbons will all be off-limits, and the results will be disastrous without anywhere else to turn for an alternative because renewables simply aren't prepared to fill that gap. Hundreds of thousands of people will lose their jobs, exports will decline, and without a reliable alternative power source, you can expect to spend most of your day in the dark. Instead of talking about plans that would hurt my constituents in Texas and bankrupt the entire country, let's have a serious conversation about real solutions.

A few weeks ago, our friend and colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS, joined me on a tour of the NET Power demonstration plant in La Porte, TX. NET Power has developed a first-of-its-kind system that generates affordable energy from natural gas while producing zero emissions. These innovative carbon capture technologies are what our future should look like. If American companies don't produce them first, well, we know somebody else will. So in America we need to invest in new technologies that can take our most reliable and affordable energy sources and make them cleaner.

When Senator McCONNELL announced his intent to bring this bill to the floor, things got a little strange in the Senate. In my experience, if the majority leader says he will bring something you authored to the floor, you are thrilled—but not with the Green New Deal. The junior Senator from Massachusetts who introduced the resolution in the first place referred to this announcement as "sabotage."

Well, clearly something is wrong. I believe it is important for us to have a discussion about smart ways to reduce emissions and lessen our environmental footprint, but the way to do that is not through heavyhanded regulations or unrealistic goals to eliminate the fuel sources we need, nor is it about throwing in socialist government power grabs that only appeal to a radical wing of the other party, which is basically a distraction from the real issues we should be discussing.

The Green New Deal is bad for America, bad for Texas, and I urge my Democratic colleagues to stop this ideological race to the left and start working with us on practical solutions that actually have a chance to become law. I will vote no on the Green New Deal resolution, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

#### FIX NICS ACT

Mr. President, this last Saturday marked 1 year since the Fix NICS Act was signed into law. This legislation meant a lot to me personally because it

fulfilled a promise I made to the members of the Sutherland Springs community after the deadliest shooting in Texas history.

On November 5, 2017, a deranged gunman opened fire in the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, killing 26 people and rocking our entire State to its core.

The gunman had a criminal record, a record of violence and mental illness. He had been convicted of domestic violence while serving in the military and by law should not have been able to purchase or possess a firearm, but the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, known as NICS, did not have a record of his crimes because they had not been transmitted by the U.S. Air Force to the FBI. In the wake of that tragedy, it is hard to rid your mind of the what-ifs. What if his criminal record had been uploaded to the NICS database? What if he had not been able to purchase a gun? For the friends and family of those lost that day, those questions are almost too tough to ask because they know the answer: Their loved ones might still be alive today.

Sadly, there is nothing we can do to bring back the loved ones they lost that day, but I knew there was something we could do to prevent other families and communities from experiencing that sort of pain, grief, and loss. Less than 2 weeks after the tragedy, Senator MURPHY from Connecticut and I introduced the Fix NICS Act to prevent these systemic failures from happening again. This legislation penalizes Federal Agencies that fail to properly report relevant crimes and incentivizes States to improve their reporting.

These sorts of commonsense reforms gained broad bipartisan support. In fact, there were 77 cosponsors here in the Senate alone, including both the majority and minority leaders, something of a rarity in my experience. It also gained the support of a diverse group of national organizations, from the National Rifle Association to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National Shooting Sports Foundation. When President Trump signed this bill 1 year ago, it marked the strongest update to the background check system in a decade.

I appreciate the support of my colleagues for this legislation. What we were able to demonstrate is that Congress can work in a bipartisan way to address a problem if we just put our minds to it. I appreciate the support of the Sutherland Springs community in the wake of the tragedy, something they are still feeling even today. I am confident that this legislation will help to save lives and make our communities safer.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Tennessee.

**NEW MANHATTAN PROJECT FOR CLEAN ENERGY**

**Mr. ALEXANDER.** Mr. President, I believe climate change is real. I believe

that human emissions of greenhouse gases are a major cause of climate change, and I believe the Democratic plan for climate change, which the Senator from Texas just spoke about—the Green New Deal—is so far out in left field that not many are going to take it seriously.

So as one Republican, I am here today to propose this response to climate change, which is that the United States should launch a New Manhattan Project for Clean Energy, a 5-year project with 10 grand challenges that will use American research and technology to put our country and our world firmly on the path for cleaner, cheaper energy.

Meeting these grand challenges would create breakthroughs in advanced nuclear reactors, natural gas, carbon recapture, better batteries, greener buildings, electric vehicles, cheaper solar power, and fusion. To provide the tools to create these breakthroughs, the Federal Government should double its funding for energy research and keep the United States No. 1 in advanced computing. This strategy takes advantage of the United States' secret weapon—our extraordinary capacity for basic research and especially in our 17 National Laboratories. It will strengthen our economy. It will raise family incomes.

This strategy also recognizes that when it comes to climate change, China, India, and other developing countries are the problem. American innovation is the answer. According to the Global Carbon Project, over the last 13 years the United States has reduced production of greenhouse gases more than any other major country. Let me say that again. According to the Global Carbon Project, over the last 13 years the United States has reduced production of greenhouse gases more than any other major country. But over the last 5 years, China and its carbon emissions have risen. The U.S. reduction is largely thanks to conservation and switching from coal to natural gas in the production of electricity.

This is the way a California physicist explains it: Our mothers told us as children to clean our plates because children in India were starving. Now, cleaning our plates was a good thing for us to do, but it didn't do much for starving children in India. In the same way, reducing carbon emissions in the United States is a good thing to do, but it doesn't do much to address climate change because most of the increase in greenhouse gases is in developing countries. If we want to do something about climate change, we should use American research and technology to provide the rest of the world with tools to create low-cost energy that emits fewer greenhouse gases.

The purpose of the original Manhattan Project during World War II was to find a way to split the atom and build a bomb before Germany could. The New York Times described this as the

“most concentrated intellectual effort in history.” Instead of ending a war, the goal of the New Manhattan Project will be to minimize the disruption on our lives and our economies caused by climate change, to clean the air, and to raise family incomes, both in our country and in the rest of the world, by creating large amounts of reliable, clean, inexpensive energy.

Can a New Manhattan Project accomplish such bold breakthroughs in just 5 years? Well, take a look at the last 5 years. Carbon emissions from energy consumption are down by 230 million metric tons. The number of electric vehicles has doubled and so has the median driving range per charge. The utility scale cost of solar power has been nearly cut in half. The number of homes has risen by 4 percent, but household energy usage has decreased by 10 percent. We lost and then we reclaimed the No. 1 spot in supercomputing. The cost of natural gas has been cut in half, and the percent of electricity provided by natural gas has increased from 27 percent to 35 percent. And that is all in the last 5 years.

I will not spend time in these remarks debunking the Green New Deal because so many others have so effectively already done that. Basically, the Green New Deal is an assault on cars, cows, and combustion. With nuclear power available, its strategy for fighting climate change with windmills makes as much sense as going to war in sailboats. As a bonus, and as the Senator from Texas outlined, it throws in free college, a guaranteed job with a government-set wage, and it would take away private health insurance on the job from 170 million Americans, and no one has any earthly idea what it will cost taxpayers.

You don't have to believe that humans cause climate change to believe in the New Manhattan Project for Clean Energy, and you don't have to be a Republican. Hopefully, the New Manhattan Project for Clean Energy can become a bipartisan proposal. Many of its 10 grand challenges have been proposed by the National Institute of Engineering and the National Academy of Sciences. At different times, Barack Obama, John McCain, Newt Gingrich, and Howard Dean have all called for a Manhattan Project for new energy sources.

These are the 10 grand challenges:

First is advanced nuclear. Ninety-eight nuclear reactors produce 60 percent of all carbon-free electricity in the United States. There has never been a death as a result of an accident at one of these reactors. The problem is that in competition with natural gas and coal, these reactors cost too much to build and some of them cost too much to operate. According to the Energy Information Administration, 11 reactors may shut down over the next 5 years. Building the Vogtle nuclear plant in Georgia—the only two new reactors being built in the United States—could cost as much as \$27.5 billion. Building two natural gas plants to

create the same amount of electricity would cost less than \$2 billion. We need to stop talking about advanced reactors and actually build something. Within the next 5 years, we need to build one or more advanced reactors to demonstrate the capabilities they may bring—lower costs, increased safety, and less nuclear waste.

Natural gas. During the 1980s, American enterprise and technology created a new, cheaper way to produce natural gas in the United States. This helped our country lead the world in reducing carbon emissions because natural gas has about half the carbon emissions as a typical coal plant. Continuing to develop new combustion technologies will make natural gas-fired electric generation more efficient and further reduce carbon emissions.

Next is carbon capture. This is really the holy grail of clean energy. Coal is cheap. There is a lot of it. Already we know how to capture sulfur, nitrogen, and mercury from coal plants to clean the air. We have seen that happen in Tennessee. If we can figure out a way also to capture carbon at a cheaper cost and find large-scale uses for its by-product—for example, CO<sub>2</sub> to ethanol—coal could be used everywhere in the world. The Natural Resources Defense Council has argued that after conservation, coal with carbon capture is the best option for clean energy.

Next is better batteries. The all-electric Nissan Leaf that I bought in 2011 had a hard time getting me from the Capitol to Dulles airport and back. Its range was about 70 miles. Today, the Nissan Leaf can travel 226 miles on one charge. A Tesla Model S can travel 335 miles on one charge. The price of lithium-ion batteries should fall another 45 percent during the next 5 years. Better batteries can also one day allow utilities and their customers to store large amounts of electricity during nonpeak hours.

Greener buildings. Despite considerable recent progress, this is still the real low-hanging fruit. Residential and commercial buildings still consume 39 percent of U.S. energy.

The next grand challenge is electric vehicles. Ten years ago there were no mass-produced electric cars on United States highways. Today there are 1 million, and you read in the paper almost every day about a major automaker making a large investment to make millions more.

Cheaper solar. Solar power has grown by 1,500 percent since 2011, but it still accounts for only about 2 percent of U.S. electricity. The new goal for the Department of Energy's SunShot Initiative is to lower the cost of solar another 50 percent to 3 cents per kilowatt hour for utility scale solar.

Then there is fusion. This is the ultimate green energy dream—to make electricity on Earth the way the Sun makes it. Instead of splitting elements, combine them and make clean, almost limitless energy without waste. This is still a dream, but there can be meaningful progress in the next 5 years.

Advanced computing. China, Japan, the United States, and the European Union—all want to be first in advanced computing. The stakes are high because the winner has an advantage in such things as advanced manufacturing, simulating advanced reactors and weapons before they are built, finding terrorists, saving billions of Medicaid waste, and simulating the electric grid in a natural disaster.

The United States regained the No. 1 spot last year in advanced computing, thanks to sustained funding by Congress during both the Obama and Trump administrations, and we need to keep that position.

The final grand challenge is to double energy research funding. Advanced computing is the first tool the New Manhattan Project needs to meet its grand challenges. The second tool is money. It would take \$6 billion annually to double funding for the Department of Energy's Office of Science and its 17 National Laboratories, which is where most of our Nation's basic energy research is done. By comparison, many estimate the cost of the Green New Deal in the trillions.

This is a bold agenda and, hopefully, a bipartisan agenda. It is an agenda that can, over the next 5 years, place Americans firmly on the path toward dealing with climate change and at the same time produce large amounts of reliable, clean energy that lifts family incomes in our country and around the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a 2012 op-ed in the *New York Times*, entitled "The Conversion of a Climate-Change Skeptic," authored by Richard Muller, a professor of physics at the University of California, Berkeley, and, second, an address I made in Oak Ridge, TN, in 2008, which called for a New Manhattan Project for Clean Energy Independence, be printed in the *RECORD* following my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *New York Times*, July 28, 2012]

#### THE CONVERSION OF A CLIMATE-CHANGE SKEPTIC

(By Richard A. Muller)

Call me a converted skeptic. Three years ago I identified problems in previous climate studies that, in my mind, threw doubt on the very existence of global warming. Last year, following an intensive research effort involving a dozen scientists, I concluded that global warming was real and that the prior estimates of the rate of warming were correct. I'm now going a step further: Humans are almost entirely the cause.

My total turnaround, in such a short time, is the result of careful and objective analysis by the Berkeley Earth Surface Temperature project, which I founded with my daughter Elizabeth. Our results show that the average temperature of the earth's land has risen by two and a half degrees Fahrenheit over the past 250 years, including an increase of one and a half degrees over the most recent 50 years. Moreover, it appears likely that essentially all of this increase results from the human emission of greenhouse gases.

These findings are stronger than those of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate

Change, the United Nations group that defines the scientific and diplomatic consensus on global warming. In its 2007 report, the I.P.C.C. concluded only that most of the warming of the prior 50 years could be attributed to humans. It was possible, according to the I.P.C.C. consensus statement, that the warming before 1956 could be because of changes in solar activity, and that even a substantial part of the more recent warming could be natural.

Our Berkeley Earth approach used sophisticated statistical methods developed largely by our lead scientist, Robert Rohde, which allowed us to determine earth land temperature much further back in time. We carefully studied issues raised by skeptics: biases from urban heating (we duplicated our results using rural data alone), from data selection (prior groups selected fewer than 20 percent of the available temperature stations; we used virtually 100 percent), from poor station quality (we separately analyzed good stations and poor ones) and from human intervention and data adjustment (our work is completely automated and hands-off). In our papers we demonstrate that none of these potentially troublesome effects unduly biased our conclusions.

The historic temperature pattern we observed has abrupt dips that match the emissions of known explosive volcanic eruptions; the particulates from such events reflect sunlight, make for beautiful sunsets and cool the earth's surface for a few years. There are small, rapid variations attributable to El Niño and other ocean currents such as the Gulf Stream; because of such oscillations, the "flattening" of the recent temperature rise that some people claim is not, in our view, statistically significant. What has caused the gradual but systematic rise of two and a half degrees? We tried fitting the shape to simple math functions (exponentials, polynomials), to solar activity and even to rising functions like world population. By far the best match was to the record of atmospheric carbon dioxide, measured from atmospheric samples and air trapped in polar ice.

Just as important, our record is long enough that we could search for the fingerprint of solar variability, based on the historical record of sunspots. That fingerprint is absent. Although the I.P.C.C. allowed for the possibility that variations in sunlight could have ended the "Little Ice Age," a period of cooling from the 14th century to about 1850, our data argues strongly that the temperature rise of the past 250 years cannot be attributed to solar changes. This conclusion is, in retrospect, not too surprising; we've learned from satellite measurements that solar activity changes the brightness of the sun very little.

How definite is the attribution to humans? The carbon dioxide curve gives a better match than anything else we've tried. Its magnitude is consistent with the calculated greenhouse effect—extra warming from trapped heat radiation. These facts don't prove causality and they shouldn't end skepticism, but they raise the bar: to be considered seriously, an alternative explanation must match the data at least as well as carbon dioxide does. Adding methane, a second greenhouse gas, to our analysis doesn't change the results. Moreover, our analysis does not depend on large, complex global climate models, the huge computer programs that are notorious for their hidden assumptions and adjustable parameters. Our result is based simply on the close agreement between the shape of the observed temperature rise and the known greenhouse gas increase.

It's a scientist's duty to be properly skeptical. I still find that much, if not most, of what is attributed to climate change is speculative, exaggerated or just plain wrong. I've

analyzed some of the most alarmist claims, and my skepticism about them hasn't changed.

Hurricane Katrina cannot be attributed to global warming. The number of hurricanes hitting the United States has been going down, not up; likewise for intense tornadoes. Polar bears aren't dying from receding ice, and the Himalayan glaciers aren't going to melt by 2035. And it's possible that we are currently no warmer than we were a thousand years ago, during the "Medieval Warm Period" or "Medieval Optimum," an interval of warm conditions known from historical records and indirect evidence like tree rings. And the recent warm spell in the United States happens to be more than offset by cooling elsewhere in the world, so its link to "global" warming is weaker than tenuous.

The careful analysis by our team is laid out in five scientific papers now online at BerkeleyEarth.org. That site also shows our chart of temperature from 1753 to the present, with its clear fingerprint of volcanoes and carbon dioxide, but containing no component that matches solar activity. Four of our papers have undergone extensive scrutiny by the scientific community, and the newest, a paper with the analysis of the human component, is now posted, along with the data and computer programs used. Such transparency is the heart of the scientific method; if you find our conclusions implausible, tell us of any errors of data or analysis.

What about the future? As carbon dioxide emissions increase, the temperature should continue to rise. I expect the rate of warming to proceed at a steady pace, about one and a half degrees over land in the next 50 years, less if the oceans are included. But if China continues its rapid economic growth (it has averaged 10 percent per year over the last 20 years) and its vast use of coal (it typically adds one new gigawatt per month), then that same warming could take place in less than 20 years.

Science is that narrow realm of knowledge that, in principle, is universally accepted. I embarked on this analysis to answer questions that, to my mind, had not been answered. I hope that the Berkeley Earth analysis will help settle the scientific debate regarding global warming and its human causes. Then comes the difficult part: agreeing across the political and diplomatic spectrum about what can and should be done.

#### A NEW MANHATTAN PROJECT FOR CLEAN ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

SEVEN "GRAND CHALLENGES" FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS: PLUG-IN ELECTRIC CARS AND TRUCKS, CARBON CAPTURE, SOLAR POWER, NUCLEAR WASTE, ADVANCED BIOFUELS, GREEN BUILDINGS, FUSION

MAY 9TH, 2008

#### History

In 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt asked Sen. Kenneth McKellar, the Tennessee who chaired the Appropriations Committee, to hide \$2 billion in the appropriations bill for a secret project to win World War II.

Sen. McKellar replied, "Mr. President, I have just one question: where in Tennessee do you want me to hide it?"

That place in Tennessee turned out to be Oak Ridge, one of three secret cities that became the principal sites for the Manhattan Project.

The purpose of the Manhattan Project was to find a way to split the atom and build a bomb before Germany could. Nearly 200,000 people worked secretly in 30 different sites in three countries. President Roosevelt's \$2 billion appropriation would be \$24 billion today.

According to New York Times science reporter William Laurence, "Into [the bomb's]

design went millions of man-hours of what is without doubt the most concentrated intellectual effort in history."

#### *The goal: victory over blackmail*

I am in Oak Ridge today to propose that the United States launch a new Manhattan project: a 5-year project to put America firmly on the path to clean energy independence.

Instead of ending a war, the goal will be clean energy independence—so that we can deal with rising gasoline prices, electricity prices, clean air, climate change and national security—for our country first, and—because other countries have the same urgent needs and therefore will adopt our ideas—for the rest of the world.

By independence I do not mean that the United States would never buy oil from Mexico or Canada or Saudi Arabia. By independence I do mean that the United States could never be held hostage by any country for our energy needs.

In 1942, many were afraid that the first country to build an atomic bomb could blackmail the rest of the world. Today, countries that supply oil and natural gas can blackmail the rest of the world.

#### *Not a new idea*

A new Manhattan Project is not a new idea—but it is a good idea and fits the goal of clean energy independence.

The Apollo Program to send men to the moon in the 1960s was a kind of Manhattan Project. Presidential candidates John McCain and Barack Obama have called for a Manhattan Project for new energy sources. So have former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, Democratic National Committee chairman Howard Dean, Sen. Susan Collins of Maine and Sen. Kit Bond of Missouri—among others.

And, throughout the two years of discussion that led to the passage in 2007 of the America COMPETES Act, several participants suggested that focusing on energy independence would force the kind of investments in the physical sciences and research that the United States needs to maintain its competitiveness.

#### *A new overwhelming challenge*

The overwhelming challenge in 1942 was the prospect that Germany would build the bomb and win the war before America did.

The overwhelming challenge today, according to National Academy of Sciences president Ralph Cicerone, in his address last week to the Academy's annual meeting, is to discover ways to satisfy the human demand for and use of energy in an environmentally satisfactory and affordable way so that we are not overly dependent on overseas sources.

Cicerone estimates that this year Americans will pay \$500 billion overseas for oil—that's \$1,600 for each one of us—some of it to nations that are hostile or even trying to kill us by bankrolling terrorists. Sending \$500 billion abroad weakens our dollar. It is half our trade deficit. It is forcing gasoline prices toward \$4 a gallon and crushing family budgets.

Then there are the environmental consequences. If worldwide energy usage continues to grow as it has, humans will inject as much CO<sub>2</sub> into the air from fossil fuel burning between 2000 and 2030 as they did between 1850 and 2000. There is plenty of coal to help achieve our energy independence, but there is no commercial way (yet) to capture and store the carbon from so much coal burning—and we have not finished the job of controlling sulfur, nitrogen, and mercury emissions.

#### *The Manhattan Project model fits today*

In addition to the need to meet an overwhelming challenge, other characteristics of

the original Manhattan Project are suited to this new challenge:

It needs to proceed as fast as possible along several tracks to reach the goal. According to Don Gillespie, a young engineer at Los Alamos during World War II, the "entire project was being conducted using a shotgun approach, trying all possible approaches simultaneously, without regard to cost, to speed toward a conclusion."

It needs presidential focus and bipartisan support in Congress.

It needs the kind of centralized, gruff leadership that Gen. Leslie R. Groves of the Army Corps of Engineers gave the first Manhattan Project.

It needs to "break the mold." To borrow the words of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer in a speech to Los Alamos scientists in November of 1945, the challenge of clean energy independence is "too revolutionary to consider in the framework of old ideas."

Most important, in the words of George Cowan as reported in the excellent book edited by Cynthia C. Kelly, ". . . The Manhattan Project model starts with a small, diverse group of great minds."

I said to the National Academies when we first asked for their help on the America COMPETES Act in 2005, "In Washington, D.C., most ideas fail for lack of the idea."

#### *The America COMPETES model fits, too*

There are some lessons, too, from America COMPETES.

Remember how it happened. Just three years ago—in May 2005—a bipartisan group of us asked the National Academies to tell Congress in priority order the 10 most important steps we could take to help America keep its brainpower advantage.

By October, the Academies had assembled a "small diverse group of great minds" chaired by Norm Augustine which presented to Congress and to the President 20 specific recommendations in a report called "Rising Above the Gathering Storm." We considered proposals by other competitiveness commissions.

Then, in January 2006, President Bush outlined his American Competitiveness Initiative to double over 10 years basic research budgets for the physical sciences and engineering. The Republican and Democratic Senate leaders and 68 other senators sponsored the legislation. It became law by August 2007, with strong support from Speaker Pelosi and the President.

#### *Not elected to take a vacation this year*

Combining the model of the Manhattan Project with the process of the America COMPETES Act has already begun. The National Academies have underway an "America's Energy Future" project that will be completed in 2010. Ralph Cicerone has welcomed sitting down with a bipartisan group to discuss what concrete proposals we might offer earlier than that to the new president and the new Congress. Energy Secretary Sam Bodman and Ray Orbach, the Energy Department's Under Secretary for Science, have said the same.

The presidential candidates seem ready. There is bipartisan interest in Congress. Congressman Bart Gordon, Democratic Chairman of the Science Committee in the House of Representatives—and one of the original four signers of the 2005 request to the National Academies that led to the America COMPETES Act—is here today to offer his ideas. Congressman Zach Wamp, a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee who played a key role in the America COMPETES Act, is co-host for this meeting.

I have talked with Sens. Jeff Bingaman and Pete Domenici, the chairman and senior Republican on the Energy Committee who



played such a critical role in America COM-PETES, and to Sen. Lisa Murkowski, who likely will succeed Sen. Domenici as the senior Republican on the Energy Committee.

Some say a presidential election year is no time for bipartisan action. I can't think of a better time. Voters expect presidential candidates and candidates for Congress to come up with solutions for \$4 gasoline, clean air and climate change, and the national security implications of our dependence on foreign oil. The people didn't elect us to take a vacation this year just because there is a presidential election.

*So, how to proceed?*

A few grand challenges—Sen. Bingaman's first reaction to the idea of a new Manhattan Project was that instead we need several mini-Manhattan Projects. He suggested as an example the "14 Grand Challenges for Engineering in the 21st Century" laid out by former MIT President Chuck Vest, the president of the National Institute of Engineering—three of which involve energy. I agree with Sen. Bingaman and Chuck Vest.

Congress doesn't do "comprehensive" well, as was demonstrated by the collapse of the comprehensive immigration bill. Step-by-step solutions or different tracks toward one goal are easier to digest and have fewer surprises. And, of course, the original Manhattan Project itself proceeded along several tracks toward one goal.

*Here are my criteria for choosing several grand challenges:*

Grand consequences, too—The United States uses 25 percent of all the energy in the world. Interesting solutions for small problems producing small results should be a part of some other project.

Real scientific breakthroughs—This is not about drilling offshore for oil or natural gas in an environmentally clean way or building a new generation of nuclear power plants, both of which we already know how to do—and, in my opinion, should be doing.

Five years—Grand challenges should put the United States within five years firmly on a path to clean energy independence so that goal can be achieved within a generation.

Family Budget—Solutions need to fit the family budget, and costs of different solutions need to be compared.

Consensus—The Augustine panel that drafted the "Gathering Storm" report wisely avoided some germane topics, such as excessive litigation, upon which they could not agree, figuring that Congress might not be able to agree either.

*Seven grand challenges:*

Here is where I invite your help. Rather than having members of Congress proclaim these challenges, or asking scientists alone to suggest them, I believe there needs to be preliminary discussion—including about whether the criteria are correct. Then, Congress can pose to scientists questions about the steps to take to achieve the grand challenges.

To begin the discussion, I suggest asking what steps Congress and the federal government should take during the next five years toward these seven grand challenges so that the United States would be firmly on the path toward clean energy independence within a generation:

1. Make plug-in electric cars and trucks commonplace. In the 1960s, H. Ross Perot noticed that when banks in Texas locked their doors at 5 p.m., they also turned off their new computers. Perot bought the idle nighttime bank computer capacity and made a deal with states to manage Medicare and Medicaid data. Banks made money, states saved money, and Perot made a billion dollars.

Idle nighttime bank computer capacity in the 1960s reminds me of idle nighttime power plant capacity in 2008. This is why:

The Tennessee Valley Authority has 7,000–8,000 megawatts—the equivalent of seven or eight nuclear power plants or 15 coal plants—of unused electric capacity most nights.

Beginning in 2010 Nissan, Toyota, General Motors and Ford will sell electric cars that can be plugged into wall sockets. FedEx is already using hybrid delivery trucks.

TVA could offer "smart meters" that would allow its 8.7 million customers to plug in their vehicles to "fill up" at night for only a few dollars, in exchange for the customer paying more for electricity between 4 p.m. and 10 p.m. when the grid is busy.

Sixty percent of Americans drive less than 30 miles each day. Those Americans could drive a plug-in electric car or truck without using a drop of gasoline. By some estimates, there is so much idle electric capacity in power plants at night that over time we could replace three-fourths of our light vehicles with plug-ins. That could reduce our overseas oil bill from \$500 billion to \$250 billion—and do it all without building one new power plant.

In other words, we have the plug. The cars are coming. All we need is the cord.

Too good to be true? Haven't U.S. presidents back to Nixon promised revolutionary vehicles? Yes, but times have changed. Batteries are better. Gas is \$4. We are angry about sending so many dollars overseas, worried about climate change and clean air. And, consumers have already bought one million hybrid vehicles and are waiting in line to buy more—even without the plug-in. Down the road is the prospect of a hydrogen fuel-cell hybrid vehicle, with two engines—neither of which uses a drop of gasoline. Oak Ridge is evaluating these opportunities.

Still, there are obstacles. Expensive batteries make the additional cost per electric car \$8,000–\$11,000. Smart metering is not widespread. There will be increased pollution from the operation of coal plants at night. We know how to get rid of those sulfur, nitrogen, and mercury pollutants (and should do it), but haven't yet found a way to get rid of the carbon produced by widespread use in coal burning power plants. Which brings us to the second grand challenge:

2. Make carbon capture and storage a reality for coal-burning power plants. This was one of the National Institute of Engineering's grand challenges. And there may be solutions other than underground storage, such as using algae to capture carbon. Interestingly, the Natural Resources Defense Council argues that, after conservation, coal with carbon capture is the best option for clean energy independence because it provides for the growing power needs of the U.S. and will be easily adopted by other countries.

3. Make solar power cost competitive with power from fossil fuels. This is a second of the National Institute's grand challenges. Solar power, despite 50 years of trying, produces one one-hundredth of one percent of America's electricity. The cost of putting solar panels on homes averages \$25,000–\$30,000 and the electricity produced, for the most part, can't be stored. Now, there is new photovoltaic research as well as promising solar thermal power plants, which capture the sunlight using mirrors, turn heat into steam, and store it underground until the customer needs it.

4. Safely reprocess and store nuclear waste. Nuclear plants produce 20 percent of America's electricity, but 70 percent of America's clean electricity—that is, electricity that does not pollute the air with mercury, nitrogen, sulfur, or carbon. The most important

breakthrough needed during the next five years to build more nuclear power plants is solving the problem of what to do with nuclear waste. A political stalemate has stopped nuclear waste from going to Yucca Mountain in Nevada, and \$15 billion collected from ratepayers for that purpose is sitting in a bank. Recycling waste could reduce its mass by 90 percent, creating less stuff to store temporarily while long-term storage is resolved.

5. Make advanced biofuels cost-competitive with gasoline. The backlash toward ethanol made from corn because of its effect on food prices is a reminder to beware of the great law of unintended consequences when issuing grand challenges. Ethanol from cellulosic materials shows great promise, but there are a limited number of cars capable of using alternative fuels and of places for drivers to buy it. Turning coal into liquid fuel is an established technology, but expensive and a producer of much carbon.

6. Make new buildings green buildings. Japan believes it may miss its 2012 Kyoto goals for greenhouse gas reductions primarily because of energy wasted by inefficient buildings. Many of the technologies needed to do this are known. Figuring out how to accelerate their use in a decentralized society is most of this grand challenge.

7. Provide energy from fusion. The idea of recreating on Earth the way the sun creates energy and using it for commercial power is the third grand challenge suggested by the National Institute of Engineering. The promise of sustaining a controlled fusion reaction for commercial power generation is so fantastic that the five-year goal should be to do everything possible to reach the long-term goal. The failure of Congress to approve the President's budget request for U.S. participation in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor—the ITER Project—is embarrassing.

*Anything is possible*

This country of ours is a remarkable place. Even during an economic slowdown, we will produce this year about 30 percent of all the wealth in the world for the 5 percent of us who live in the United States.

Despite "the gathering storm" of concern about American competitiveness, no other country approaches our brainpower advantage—the collection of research universities, national laboratories and private-sector companies we have.

And this is still the only country where people say with a straight face that anything is possible—and really believe it.

These are precisely the ingredients that America needs during the next five years to place ourselves firmly on a path to clean energy independence within a generation—and in doing so, to make our jobs more secure, to help balance the family budget, to make our air cleaner and our planet safer and healthier—and to lead the world to do the same.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday, Attorney General Barr

transmitted to Congress his summary of the special counsel's principal conclusions from his investigation into Russia's efforts to interfere in the 2016 election.

The result of that investigation is being hailed as good news for the President, and it certainly is that. But, really, it is good news for our entire country. It is good news that our law enforcement professionals know much more about Russia's malevolent attempts to interfere in American elections, and it is good news that we can conclusively set aside the notion that the President and his team had somehow participated in those attacks on our democracy.

According to the Attorney General, the special counsel's indepth investigation "did not find that the Trump campaign or anyone associated with it conspired or coordinated with Russia in its efforts to influence the 2016 U.S. presidential election." That really says it all.

Further, Attorney General Barr and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein concluded the investigation did not—did not—establish that the President engaged in obstruction of justice.

So after 2 years, thousands of subpoenas, hundreds of search warrants, hundreds of witnesses, millions of taxpayer dollars, these are the findings: no collusion, no conspiracy, no obstruction.

What the investigation did produce, it seems, is a deep examination of Russia's efforts to interfere in the 2016 election. The Attorney General reports that Russia carried out online disinformation campaigns and computer hacking efforts designed to sow discord in our Nation and interfere in American politics.

It is deeply disturbing that the Obama administration was apparently insufficiently prepared to anticipate and counter these Russian threats. It was hardly a secret prior to November 2016 that Putin's Russia was not, and is not, our friend. Yet, for years, the previous administration ignored, excused, and failed to confront Putin's malign activities both at home and abroad.

I am glad the special counsel's report will contribute new insight and new understanding to our awareness of Russian activities. I look forward to the release of more information in the coming days, as the Attorney General has said he intends to do, in consultation with Special Counsel Mueller.

I look forward, as well, to the continuing parallel work of our Senate colleagues on the Select Committee on Intelligence to study the threats that foreign interference pose to our institutions.

As I said, in any sane political moment, all of this would be very welcome news to all Americans—in a normal time. But we know that, amazingly, the reaction in some corners of the far left has seemed not to be celebration but, rather, disappointment.

Huge components of the Democratic Party and their media allies have spent

literally years spinning intricate theories about this Presidency and trying to sell the American people on their wild claims. It is as if many of our Democratic colleagues are still just unable to process the simple fact that, yes, the American people elected this Republican President over his Democratic opponent.

We are faced with new evidence every day that our Republican policies are delivering exactly the change that middle-class families voted for back in 2016. Yet, even still, many on the left remain convinced that only conspiracy and corruption could possibly explain why they might actually lose an election.

Well, here in the real world, the American people hired this President to clean up the mess of the preceding 8 years. That is exactly what we set about doing, and the results are clear. The Nation is clearly better off than it was 2 years ago.

I sincerely hope that now, at last, our friends on the left will be able to put aside their fixation on permanently relitigating their loss in 2016 and actually join in the productive work that the rest of us have been proudly engaged in for the past 2 years and counting.

Unfortunately, the events over the last few months have not exactly indicated that productive, practical cooperation is what our Democratic colleagues have in mind. To the contrary, the Nation has watched as the Democratic Party has engaged in a collective headlong sprint—a headlong sprint—toward the left, as far to the left as possible, as fast as possible.

They have proposed a massive rewriting of the rules of American politics. They have proposed scrapping Medicare, slapping its name on a brandnew, one-size-fits-all government insurance plan, and then making American families' existing private insurance policies illegal. And, of course, they have proposed what the Senate will be voting on later this week—the famous Green New Deal.

My colleagues and I will have plenty more to say on this subject in the coming days. Today, I just want to say that I could not be more glad that the American people will have the opportunity to learn precisely where each one of their Senators stands on this radical, top-down, and socialist makeover of the entire U.S. economy.

Middle-class families will get to see if their Senators have been wooed by the disjointed contents of leftist daydreams.

Hard-working Americans in Kentucky and around the country who are employed in the energy and manufacturing industries will get to see if their Senators support eliminating all fossil fuels and suffocating their livelihoods.

Homeowners who take pride in their hard-earned investment will get to see if their Senators are in favor of forcible, DC-directed remodeling of every building in America.

Working-class Americans who have benefited from our growing economy and historic job market will learn whether their Senators support turning away from free enterprise and implementing a new government-driven employment system.

Families who have to budget for household expenses will see which Senators vote to increase their electricity bills by what one analysis pegs at—listen to this—\$300 a month.

Of course, every American taxpayer will get to learn whether their Senator supports saddling our Nation with the astronomical cost of this socialist fantasy—tens and tens of trillions of dollars—a tax burden that would be certain to hurt not just wealthy Americans but the middle class as well.

On all of these questions, on this whole Democratic effort to rebrand all the failed ideas of 20th-century socialism with a little green paint, every Member of this body will have the opportunity to cast a clear vote this very week. The American people deserve to know which Senators can reject this crippling proposal right away and which Senators find themselves unable to do that. That is exactly what they will learn later this week.

#### NOMINATION OF BRIDGET S. BADE

Madam President, later today, the Senate will vote to advance the nomination of yet another of President Trump's qualified choices to the Federal bench.

Bridget Bade of Arizona has been tapped to serve on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. She brings with her well-rounded experience as a legal professional. She is a two-time graduate of Arizona State University and has served with distinction at the Department of Justice, the Office of the U.S. Attorney for the District of Arizona, as a special counsel in private practice, and most recently as a magistrate judge.

Our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee saw fit to forward Ms. Bade's nomination with bipartisan support, and I hope all Senators will join me in voting to advance it later today.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### TRIBUTE TO TOM UDALL

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, all of us heard the sad news today—nice for him but sad for us—that TOM UDALL will not seek reelection.

He is one of the most principled, hardest working Senators we have. He is bright, he is dedicated, and he has such integrity, which runs in the Udall family. When he gets up to speak, every Senator, Democratic and Republican, always knows how well thought out his remarks will be and how sincere they are. He is not doing this for some angle or political purpose. He is just the kind of person the Founding Fathers wanted to serve in the U.S. Senate.



TOM's leadership on reforming the campaign finance system, on protecting the environment, on advocating on behalf of Native American communities, shepherding legislation to protect America from harmful chemicals, and so much more, has been invaluable.

We will all be saying more about TOM in a little while. We will miss him. He has been a wonderful Senator, a great friend, and a wonderful member of this caucus.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, I am going to speak briefly on the matter of climate change, and then I will address matters relating to the special counsel's investigation.

During the last month, this Chamber has been the forum for debate on a topic I never thought I would see Republicans raise on their own—climate change. They have long been the party of climate change denial, with President Trump as the climate change denier-in-chief. It is an awfully difficult position to defend. It becomes more difficult every week and every month, and it is directly at odds with strong consensus views of scientists in the United States and around the globe.

As our weather changes and as we face disasters, the average American is saying more and more: Uh-oh. Climate change. I wonder what the people in Nebraska and Iowa think. They have had these huge floods that have been so devastating to them.

It is long past time for Republicans to take these issues seriously. This Chamber is supposed to debate the most serious issues of our day. Climate change is at the top of the list and shouldn't be an exception. That is why for a month all 47 Democrats have asked our Republican colleagues three simple questions, which none of them will answer. They are going to have to answer them sooner or later. One, do you agree that climate change is real? Two, do you agree that it is caused by human action? Three, do you believe that Congress should take immediate action to combat its effects?

We are not prescribing one part or another; we are saying, let's debate it. Let's not have a sham vote that is meant to embarrass one person or another. This is too serious of an issue for that. Republicans owe the American people some real answers, not games.

As I mentioned, just over the last week in the plains of Iowa, we saw the devastating effects of climate change with devastating clarity. The kind of weather we saw in the Iowa plains has no precedent. It was the equivalent of a category 2 hurricane lambasting the heart of the Midwest. Our hearts are with the people whose homes were destroyed or damaged, whose farms were decimated, and the animals that were lost.

The science is clear: A changing climate and warmer air make these freakish weather incidents more likely and more intense.

Republicans may want to keep their heads in the sand. I think that is a loser for them, especially among younger and younger voters. Like on so many other issues, Republicans are clinging to the past and not looking at what has happened, but Republicans do so at their own peril. With each passing year, their climate change denial is increasingly out of step with the American people. A majority of Americans—two-thirds, including a large percentage of Republicans—believe climate change is real and believe human action has accelerated its pace. They know it for a very simple reason—they can see it themselves.

On the South Shore of Long Island, all of a sudden after Sandy, very Republican areas understood the need to address climate change. That is happening all over the country. The American people see the effects of climate change every time a fire devastates California, another hurricane strikes the Gulf States, or Biblical flooding strikes some part of the country or another. They see them personally, not theoretically. That is what is happening. Indeed, scientists in the United States and Canada now say that the evidence for climate change has reached a "gold standard" of certainty.

What have Republicans done about it? Rather than take these warnings seriously, they choose to play games with our planet's future. Rather than get serious about the world our children will inherit, Leader MCCONNELL has elected to push a sham vote on their version of the Green New Deal. They will play that game right before voting on funding for natural disaster relief. Let there be no doubt—these disasters are magnified precisely because of climate change. I cannot fathom the level of cognitive dissonance required to schedule these two votes one right after the other.

No one is fooled by the Republican attempts to posture and politicize climate change. If they really want to debate the issue, let's debate it. Let's bring different views to the floor. Let's see how people vote. Let's not put something on the floor for the first time—a serious proposal on climate change, which the leader has never before put on the floor. Let's debate them all. We are not getting that to happen. Oh no. It is just a game—politics, politics, politics—that the American people, on this issue and so many others, dislike.

Let Republicans come at us with all they have. The facts are on the people who understand that climate change is real. It is no wonder our Republican colleagues don't want a real debate but a game. But the American people are not going to be fooled by the Republicans' stunt vote.

Democrats are prepared to take bold action to address the climate crisis head-on. That is why we are pushing for the creation of a bipartisan committee on climate change so we can examine this issue with the level of ur-

gency and depth it deserves. I urge my colleagues on the other side who know the truth to speak out and join us as we try to put a halt to the greatest threat of our time.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 24

Madam President, now on another matter, last night, Attorney General Barr delivered a brief letter to Congress that included his summary of Special Counsel Mueller's investigation. We have all seen the Attorney General's letter, but none of us—neither the Congress nor the public—have seen the report itself. The Justice Department has declined to even say how many pages the report includes, as if that were some sort of State secret.

After all, let's not forget why we are here in the first place. Two years ago, a hostile power attacked our democracy. As Mr. Barr's letter says, Russian actors, with the backing of Mr. Putin, waged a sophisticated and malicious campaign of disinformation and falsehood in order to influence the outcome of our elections. That has never happened before.

The American people deserve to see the documentation. What did they do? Whom did they approach? What happened? To sweep an issue like this under the rug, when the security of our wellspring elections—fair and not interfered with by foreign power—is at stake?

It is overwhelmingly self-evident in the public interest for the Mueller report to be released to the people. The American people simply want the truth. Each American, if he or she chooses, could read the report for themselves and draw their own conclusions. Whether or not you are a supporter of President Trump, whatever you feel, there is no good reason not to make the report public.

On March 14, just prior to the recess, the House of Representatives surprised a lot of our Republicans friends here in the Senate by passing a resolution calling for the report to be made public. Guess what the vote was. It was 420 to nothing. Even the most vociferous defenders of President Trump—Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. JORDAN—voted yes.

When the resolution arrived here in the Senate, I asked unanimous consent that it be adopted. I thought it would be. Regrettably, one Senator objected. The Senator from South Carolina—my friend, Senator GRAHAM—said he wouldn't agree to the resolution unless it was amended to call for a special prosecutor to investigate Hillary Clinton. The Senate was unable to pass the resolution that passed the House unanimously without controversy.

In fact, President Trump had said, even before the report came out and repeatedly afterward several times, that he supported passage of the House resolution and he supports making it public, and so did a good number of my Republican colleagues—a whole bunch today.

So, in a moment, I am going to renew my request of March 14 that the Senate

adopt H. Con. Res. 24, calling for public release of the Mueller report. Now that President Trump supports public release of the report, there is no good reason for anyone to object to this request.

It is a simple request for transparency, nothing more, nothing less—not to make a decision as to what you believe, not to say what we ought to do about it, but just to make it public. Transparency is a great American virtue that we have tried to uphold through the centuries.

So I hope I will not hear a request from the other side to amend the resolution to call for a different special counsel investigation. If there is going to be an objection, the American people deserve to know why—why should this report not be made public—not why something else shouldn't be done, not some extraneous issue. Why shouldn't this report be made public?

I ask my friend, the leader—I see him rising, and I imagine he is going to object—to give a reason why this report should not be made public, not that something else should be done at the same time. This is serious stuff. If there is an objection raised, it will only serve to frustrate the compelling public interest that is made in the special counsel's report in making it public.

Therefore, I will now give the Senate another opportunity to join every one of their colleagues in calling for the public release of this important report.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 24, expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress, which is at the desk; further, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I said just a few moments ago, it is certainly good news for the country that the special counsel concluded that there is no evidence that the Trump campaign collaborated or conspired with the Russian Government to influence the last Presidential election. It is also good news for the country that due to the special counsel's work, we now have more insight into Russia's efforts to interfere with our democratic institution.

Now, I have consistently supported the proposition that the special counsel should be allowed to finish his work without interference. The work of the special counsel, however, is not yet complete. Neither is the work of the Department of Justice. The Attorney General told us yesterday that he is working with the special counsel to determine how much of the special coun-

sel's report can be produced without violating the law and without jeopardizing other ongoing matters, including other matters initiated by the special counsel. The special counsel and the Justice Department ought to be allowed to finish their work in a professional manner.

Now, my good friend, the Democratic leader, was all for allowing the special counsel to conduct his work without political interference when it might be politically advantageous to him, but, apparently, my friend from New York is not for allowing the special counsel to complete his work with the Justice Department, according to his best professional and legal judgment, when that might be inconvenient to my friend's own current political purposes.

To date, the Attorney General has followed through on his commitment to the Congress. One of those commitments is that he intends to release as much information as possible. I certainly welcome that commitment to transparency, as do others, but to the extent that the Attorney General, in consulting with the special counsel, believes it is important to protect sensitive sources and methods, protect material that could affect ongoing investigations and prosecutions, and is legally protected, then he deserves the time to work through these issues.

I am going to object in order to allow the special counsel and the Justice Department to finish their careful and professional review of a, no doubt, voluminous record—a record that likely contains sensitive, classified, and legally protected material.

For all of those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will be brief. The resolution does not say it has to be done immediately. The resolution certainly allows for the Attorney General to make sure that nothing is released that violates the law. All it says is that it ought to be released. It is hard to understand why the majority leader wouldn't be for that resolution.

None of his objections—none—are in the words of the report. In fact, the words of the report are very simple. It shows a sense of the Congress that it should be released—not when, not in violation of the law, not in a hurried matter, just to be released.

So I am sort of befuddled by at least the majority leader's reasoning in this regard because it is not in the words of this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the country and the President had to wait 2 years. It has been going on for 2 years. This very expensive investigation took 2 years to be concluded. Look, it is not unreasonable to give the special counsel and the Justice Department just a little time to complete their review in a professional and responsible manner.

Remember, as I said earlier, we are likely dealing here with other potential prosecutions, classified information, and damaging people's reputations. There is no evidence that the Attorney General is not going to produce as much information as possible for all of us, and that is why I objected.

I think it is a reasonable thing to do. We have been waiting for a long time for this report to wrap up. It is largely good news, not just for the President but for the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, again, this language was good enough for every Republican in the Senate, as well as every Democrat. The President himself says it should be released. It is hard to understand why the majority leader should stand alone in objections no one else found to be reasonable or sustainable and oppose this resolution. The report should be made public, and the Senate should resolve that it should be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, revolution is deeply embedded in the character of this Nation.

More than two centuries ago, delegates from across the American colonies gathered in Philadelphia to take what was audacious action. They risked everything, including their lives, by declaring independence from the greatest and strongest power in the world at that time, the British Empire.

I am proud to say that my forefather served in George Washington's army, and he was called to risk his life and serve in the Continental Army to fight for an idea—that freedom and liberty would reign in this country.

As Americans, throughout history, we have been called to service. Sometimes we are called to service by clear and present danger, such as the bombing at Pearl Harbor. Sometimes we are called to greatness by stretching our imagination like, when we went to the Moon, and sometimes we are called to unity by necessity because the stakes of inaction are simply too high.

Today the United States faces such a challenge, and I believe we can once again prove our greatness. It is an undeniable fact that climate change, caused in large part by humans, is a threat to Michigan, our Great Lakes, our country, and our planet. Climate change poses a threat not only to the lands and waters that we all depend on but also to our health, our economy, and even our national security.

It is also undeniable that the United States, unified in purpose, can meet the challenges and defeat the threats caused by climate change, but we need to take action now. Time is simply not on our side.

Without question, taking action involves political risk, but doing nothing is simply not an option. The longer we

wait, the risks to our planet only grow more challenging and difficult to solve.

Our planet is showing clear, unequivocal evidence of climate change, according to an overwhelming scientific consensus. Our ice caps are melting. Our oceans are warming. Severe weather is becoming the new normal. Land temperatures are rising.

Just last week, an alarming new report found that the Great Lakes are warming more quickly than other parts of the country. This change will negatively impact fish species, lead to more algal blooms, cause flood damage to communities, homes, and businesses, and irreversibly alter a sensitive ecosystem that provides drinking water for 40 million Americans. I represent the Great Lakes State, and climate change threatens our economy and our way of life.

I am disappointed that instead of working together on commonsense efforts and treating climate change with the seriousness that it deserves, the Republican Senate majority leader has chosen to waste limited floor time on a political stunt.

What we should be doing is having a thoughtful debate on the need to address a significant threat to our country. Rather than playing partisan games, it is time to find unity and take bold action.

The Senate must come together to pass real, concrete policies that will help to mitigate climate change and to wean us from our dependence on fossil fuels. I know it is possible because I have worked on bipartisan efforts with my colleagues to advance clean energy and lower greenhouse gas emissions.

Together, we have advanced technology innovation, fueled our Nation's transportation with cleaner energy, bolstered our Nation's infrastructure to be more resilient to climate impacts, offered incentives for carbon capture sequestration, and boosted energy efficiency. These are all accomplishments that we have done together, but more needs to be done.

This Congress, as we consider a surface transportation reauthorization package, as well as a new Water Resources Development Act, would be foolish to ignore climate impacts as we spend taxpayer dollars for infrastructure. We must seize the opportunity presented by a clean energy economy to continue driving American innovation while creating sustainable good-paying jobs.

Today our auto industry in Michigan is rapidly working to advance electrification. Just last week, General Motors announced plans to add 400 jobs and invest \$300 million to build a new electric car at their Orion plant. But despite these efforts, our State and our country have been hurt by the lack of a coherent, cohesive, and forward-looking policy that grows our economy while protecting our environment.

We need a policy that ensures that renewable energy is produced here in America and done in a way that cre-

ates jobs and strengthens our national security. I know that we can do it if only we can find the political will.

Together, we can effectively confront climate change in a way that benefits Michigan workers and families, our Great Lakes, and the entire country.

The science is clear, but time is not on our side. We must take action now to confront climate change before it is too late. I urge my colleagues to stop playing political games. Let's roll up our sleeves and get to work on solving the climate change crisis together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

#### DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. ISAKSON. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise for a moment to talk about a vote we will have tomorrow in this Chamber on a motion to adopt an amendment to the supplemental appropriations passed by the House, and it is a disaster amendment dealing with the States that have been afflicted by disasters over the last 2 years—most of them southern States, but not all. Some include the Territory of Puerto Rico.

I am going to go over the details in a second, but first of all, some of you may see floating around this memorandum from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House and the vice chairman in the Senate. It talks about an agreement that was on the disaster money and refers to Puerto Rico being shortchanged and the fact that we need to make sure that that doesn't happen. I want to give you the facts.

Georgia, which I represent, is one of a number of States that includes Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alaska, California, and Hawaii, which have experienced significant disasters in the past 2 years. We saw the fires in California on our TVs. We saw the volcanoes in Hawaii. We saw the blueberries in Georgia fall off the vines and be destroyed. We saw what happened to these crops and Alaska's earthquake. All of these States have received nothing yet.

Puerto Rico has received \$40 billion—\$40 billion for what happened in Maria, and \$21 billion has not been spent. They have gotten a lot of money, \$40 billion, and the amendment I want to talk about in a second gives them \$600 million more.

There are a lot of places in this country that are States that we represent that have gotten nothing and have had big disasters in the last 2 years. These disasters are hurting our economy, our people, and our States.

So I want to—any of you to see this email or this flyer tomorrow or hear the debate tomorrow. What it says, the flyer says that the vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator LEAHY, is going to object to the substitute that will be offered by Senator PERDUE and myself tomorrow to the bill that will be debated unless Puerto Rico gets a better shake. The

point, Puerto Rico has gotten 40, only spent 19, they have got \$21 billion left to spend. We have \$600 million to see to it that they don't run out of SNAP money at the end of this month, which they will with everything that stands currently. Puerto Rico is being treated great. Is there CDBG money they want? No, it is not in there.

"Fair" is an interesting word. Fair is when you and I are treated fairly. We both get equal proportions, for money and things of that nature. Unfair is when somebody weights the formula—or someone takes undue advantage of a special situation.

Well, this is a special situation. A lot of people are going to go without help by the end of next month. Farm bills are going to come due, and banks are going to foreclose on them. A lot of people in agriculture will be hurt badly. People who have been hurt by the fires in California will not be helped. Those who expressed help for earthquake damage in Alaska will not be helped. A lot of people will not be helped.

We need to put off this guise of fairness and be really fair. Let's see that we put in the \$600 million, which the amendment does and see to it that people on SNAP in Puerto Rico get their money. Let's see to it that those people in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina and other States damaged by floods, hurricanes, or fires get their money.

There will be more emergencies, and we all know that. We all hate emergencies for a lot of reasons—appropriators, especially. Nobody wants to have to do that, but when our State, your State or mine, is injured dramatically in a disastrous hurricane or tornado or whatever, we as a country have always passionately dealt with the results of those storms, the losses those States have felt, and helped those States get back on their feet and those people be served.

We are not asking for a handout; we are asking for a hand up in each of those States, and they have been waiting for a long time. Those who know what I am talking about, who is from Georgia, we have farmers who have gone through a cycle and their farm financing was done through banks that, at the end of this month, will have to act on those loans and call them for payment or have a refinance schedule knowing that they got some money coming down the line. If this passes and is agreed to by the House and the banks get the message that we are trying to help them like we have always had in the past, they will have a chance to make the negotiations, pay the money back that they borrowed, and do it over time and give people jobs in the field rather than go back and tell them we can't give them money and help them and lose the farm and business and us lose a lot of jobs.

It is just not right, and it is not fair. I used the word "fair" just then because I think fair is the definition of

seeing to it that Puerto Rico, Georgia, and South Carolina get help.

If you get this argument, read it. It sounds like we agreed to something 3 weeks ago, and now, all of a sudden, we are not agreeing to the same thing. That is not true. We agreed last week when we left what this vote would be tomorrow, what the supplemental will look like, what would be included in it, and as I understood it and my sense of understanding, we agreed to all the things. Was there enough money for Puerto Rico for what they wanted? No, they wanted more. Would Florida like more? Would Georgia like more? North Carolina like more? Yes. But in fairness of equity, it is fair and equitable to those people.

I would urge you to listen to the debate and what everybody tells you what happened before you make a decision and everyone gets hurt. Instead what you are going to do, if you fall for this scenario, you are going to really hurt some people who will otherwise be helped through deliberations that have taken over the part of the last 2 or 3 months.

Mr. President, I appreciate the time and the time to come here. I wish I could talk about something other than disasters, but I can't. A lot of people lost their lives and farms and their future. I want to see that we help in an equitable fashion in those States and those Territories that we do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

#### THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise to speak this afternoon on the upcoming vote on the majority leader's Green New Deal resolution, a resolution that, ironically, he apparently does not support.

First I want to say this about the Green New Deal: Even our Republican friends cannot deny that this resolution has sparked a national conversation and generated a great deal of enthusiasm among the American people, especially among younger Americans.

It reminds me of the time when I was a young naval flight officer stationed at Moffett Field Naval Air Station just south of San Francisco, waiting to be deployed to Southeast Asia during the Vietnam war. I joined millions of Americans across our country that year and celebrated our Nation's very first Earth Day.

As I listen to the rising chorus of voices calling for climate action today, I hear the sounds of that day in Golden Gate Park. I remember the urgency we felt then to address the environmental challenges facing our Nation and our world, and I feel an even greater sense of urgency today. That is why it is so disappointing to me that our Republican colleagues—not all of them but a number of them—are trying to make a mockery of the very real concerns and the passionate calls for action we are hearing from people all across this country and, indeed, all around the world.

This is not a time for derision. This is not a time for division. On an issue as serious as this one, we ought to be serious about addressing it. However, it has become clear that some—not all but some—of our Republican friends would rather have some fun and talk, maybe, about hamburgers and cheeseburgers and that kind of thing. Worse, some have conflated meaningful action on climate change with socialism.

With the death of our late colleague John McCain, I am the last Vietnam veteran serving in the U.S. Senate. I served 5 years in a hot war in Southeast Asia to oppose the expansion of communism. Shortly after we celebrated that first-ever Earth Day in 1970, I was sent on the first of three deployments in Southeast Asia before eventually serving another 18 years until the end of the Cold War as a Navy P-3 aircraft mission commander in the Naval Reserve and retiring as a Navy captain after chasing Soviet submarines in all of the oceans of the world.

I am not a socialist. Like most of our colleagues here, I am an American patriot and proud to be one. I care deeply about this planet, and I know we can have cleaner air and water while creating jobs. Those two things are not mutually exclusive. Our Republican colleagues know better than that, and they owe our country better than that.

In recent weeks, our Republican colleagues have thrown around a \$93 trillion number. That wildly overestimated number primarily refers to provisions in the Green New Deal that are not directly related to climate change.

At a time when our country is looking to Congress for leadership on climate action, hiding behind political games, deception, and scare tactics is irresponsible. It is cowardly when we ought to be brave.

Right now a clear majority of Americans want us, in Congress, to address the growing climate crisis that is facing our country and our planet. We should be having a fact-based, policy-driven conversation about tackling this crisis, and we should be talking about the real costs that confront us, including the cost of inaction.

I live in Delaware, the lowest lying State in our country. Our State is sinking. The oceans around us are rising. According to our Nation's leading scientists, climate change unchecked means more sea level rise, costing coastal communities up and down the east coast—like my State—trillions of dollars in economic damages over the next 80 years.

In the Northeast we are experiencing rain events in which we are measuring rain by the foot, not the inch. Not too far from where we stand today, Ellicott City, MD, has experienced not one but two 1,000-year floods. They have withstood not one but two 1,000-year floods in less than 2 years.

Today, our hearts go out to our neighbors along the Missouri River Basin as they are suffering through

catastrophic flooding. As of Friday, the cost of damage to Nebraska alone had already surpassed \$1.3 billion, and the damage to Iowa alone was estimated at \$1.6 billion. Some cities are currently without fresh water. In Missouri, entire communities have been evacuated. In Northwestern Missouri, roughly 40,000 acres of farmland was still underwater this past Friday.

Our Nation's scientists tell us that climate change unchecked means more frequent and more intense storms, meaning bomb cyclones. I didn't even know there was such a thing as bomb cyclones, but there are. Intense rainfalls and category 5 hurricanes are becoming the new normal.

Last year, we witnessed the tragic devastation caused by wildfires fueled by drought and heat, like the California wildfires. Imagine what we could face in 2050 when, according to our Nation's scientists, wildfire seasons burn up to six times more forest area each year.

The extreme weather events we see are already taking a toll on American lives, on American livelihoods, and on our Nation's budget. According to NOAA, in 2017 alone, extreme weather cost Americans \$300 billion in economic damages—a new record. That same year, the Federal Government spent \$120 billion in Federal disaster spending for just four extreme weather events—just four.

Earlier this month, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office released its biennial high-risk list and once again identified climate change as a significant fiscal risk to the Federal Government and, I might add, to taxpayers.

According to GAO, since 2005, Federal funding for disaster assistance has reached \$430 billion—nearly one-half trillion dollars—and those costs will continue to rise. GAO says: "Disaster costs are projected to increase as extreme weather events become more frequent and intense due to climate change."

NOAA and NASA tell us these numbers will be a drop in the bucket compared to our new climate future if we do not act on climate change. If we do not change course, just about every major economic sector in the United States will be negatively affected by climate change by the turn of this century. Some sectors could see hundreds of billions of dollars of losses every year.

Add it all up, and climate change could slash up to 10 percent of our gross domestic product, GDP, by 2100. I like to say, compared to what? Well, for context, that would be more than double the losses incurred during the great recession of the last decade. However, all of these costs are woefully underestimated. How can we put a price tag on the toll of this destruction? What is the cost of our fourth-generation farm family who loses their land and their livestock? What is the cost of a bridge inundated by water, separating a community from a hospital or

other emergency services? What is the cost of the family who loses a child to an asthma attack on a high particulate matter day?

The circumstances I have laid out are dire because that is the crisis we face, and we cannot evade it into oblivion. This poster says it all: "No matter where we live, we can't ignore the reality of climate change or its effects." We have to accept and address this crisis.

As Albert Einstein once said, in adversity lies opportunity. The opportunity before us is even greater. More than 3 million people have gone to work in the clean energy sector in the United States in recent years, and those jobs are in renewable energy generation, energy efficiency, smart grid and storage, cleaner fuels, and lower emission vehicles.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 more minutes to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Nearly 500,000 of these clean energy jobs are in the solar and wind industries, and one out of every six construction workers in this country now make their living in emergency and energy efficiency. One out of every five companies involved in making motor vehicle parts makes their money from products that make our cars, trucks, and vans cleaner.

Our clean energy revolution did not happen by accident. We put smart policies in place, and we had leadership that believed climate change was a threat. During the Obama administration, starting with the Recovery Act, the Federal Government provided economic incentives and smart regulations to support market investments and clean energy. We must build on this progress and continue to support policies that reduce our Nation's carbon footprint, help create a more robust economy, and support those most vulnerable to climate change.

Yet instead of pursuing any ideas to address climate change and protect Americans from its effect, the Trump administration has sadly decided to ignore climate change, decided to defund clean energy research and roll back any meaningful climate action, decided to walk away from provisions that would help protect Americans from rising floods and other extreme weather events.

Our President's failed leadership on climate change threatens our health, our economy, U.S. competitiveness, and our future. Sadly, most of our—not all—but most of our Republican friends have been applauding the President with every action.

In conclusion, let me just say to the American people, don't be fooled or distracted by the political games. We cannot allow cynicism to win. We can reduce our Nation's carbon footprint; we can strengthen our economy; and we can support those most vulnerable among us—indeed, we must. Climate

change is real. Human activity is the dominant cause. Congress needs to act. Stop the political theater and start to address the climate change before us today while we still have time, and we do.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Bridget S. Bade, of Arizona, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, James E. Risch, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, Pat Roberts, Jerry Moran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate on the nomination of Bridget S. Bade, of Arizona, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 77, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 50 Ex.]

### YEAS—77

Alexander	Daines	King
Barrasso	Duckworth	Lankford
Bennet	Durbin	Leahy
Blackburn	Enzi	Lee
Blunt	Ernst	Manchin
Boozman	Feinstein	McConnell
Braun	Fischer	McSally
Brown	Gardner	Moran
Burr	Graham	Murkowski
Capito	Grassley	Murphy
Cardin	Hassan	Paul
Carper	Hawley	Perdue
Cassidy	Heinrich	Portman
Collins	Hoeven	Reed
Coons	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cornyn	Isakson	Roberts
Cotton	Johnson	Romney
Cramer	Jones	Rosen
Crapo	Kaine	Rounds
Cruz	Kennedy	Rubio

Sasse	Sinema	Van Hollen
Schatz	Sullivan	Warner
Scott (FL)	Tester	Whitehouse
Scott (SC)	Thune	Wicker
Shaheen	Tillis	Young
Shelby	Toomey	

### NAYS—20

Baldwin	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Markey	Smith
Casey	Menendez	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	

### NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe	Udall	Warren
--------	-------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 77, the nays are 20.

The motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on the Bade nomination expire at 2:15 p.m. tomorrow; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. I further ask that following the disposition of the Bade nomination, the Senate proceed to legislative session and resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 88, with the time until 4 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; finally, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, that the cloture motions with respect to the motions to proceed to S.J. Res. 8 and H.R. 268 ripen at 4 p.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### TRIBUTE TO WILLARD KINZER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today it is my honor to pay tribute to Willard Kinzer, a one-of-a-kind Kentuckian who will receive a lifetime achievement award at the beginning of April. Willard, a leading figure in Floyd County, seems to have done it all.

He is a World War II veteran, who felt compelled to join the Navy after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Willard's a nonstop worker, becoming a prominent entrepreneur in eastern Kentucky, leading Kinzer Drilling through expansions and growth. His philanthropy has helped build schools in his native Appalachia and has supported the Mountain Arts Center, and perhaps most unexpectedly Willard holds the distinction